Bonneville Power Administration
Fish and Wildlife Program FY99 Proposal Form

Section 1. General administrative information

Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge Wildlife Mitigation Project (CTUIR Lease of Corps Lands)

Bonneville project number, if an ongoing project 9705915

Business name of agency, institution or organization requesting funding
Confederated Tribes of the
Umatilla Indian Reservation

Business acronym (if appropriate) CTUIR

Proposal contact person or principal investigator:

Name	Carl Scheeler
Mailing Address	P.O Box 638
City, ST Zip	Pendleton, Oregon 97850
Phone	(541) 278-5267
Fax	(541) 276-4348
Email address	wildlife@ucinet.com

Subcontractors. List one subcontractor per row; to add more rows, press Alt-Insert from within this table

Organization	Mailing Address	City, ST Zip	Contact Name
Umatilla County Weed Control Board	3920 Westgate	Pendleton, OR 97801	Bonnie Rathmuson

NPPC Program Measure Number(s) which this project addresses.

7.6.A, 7.6 B, 7.6.C, 11.3A, 11.3D

NMFS Biological Opinion Number(s) which this project addresses.

N/A

Other planning document references.

CTUIR Wildlife Mitigation Plan for the John Day and McNary Dams (October, 1997); Wy Kan Ush Me Wa Kush Wit, CRITFC; Oregon Trust Agreement (OTA) Planning Project, prepared by Oregon wildlife managers for BPA; BPA Wildlife Mitigation Program Final EIS; BPA Watershed Management Program Final EIS; Assessing OTA Planning Project Using GAP Analysis; prepared by ODFW for BPA; Status of the interior Columbia Basin: summary of scientific finding, USDA Forest Service, Columbia River Basin; CTWSRO Integrated Resource Management Plan; ODFW District Wildlife Management Plans.

If the project type is "Watershed" (see Section 2), reference any demonstrable support from affected agencies, tribes, local watershed groups, and public and/or private landowners, and cite available documentation.

The Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge Project is a wildlife mitigation project for McNary target wildlife mitigation species.

Subbasin.

Mainstem Middle Columbia River, Juniper Canyon Subbasin

Short description.

Protect, enhance, and mitigate wildlife habitat impacted by hydroelectric development in McNary Project Area. Achieve NPPC wildlife mitigation objectives in a cost efficient manner by protecting and enhancing existing public lands located onsite where original habitat inundation occurred. New Project Start (FY98) NPPC Wildlife Mitigation Project Under "Securing Wildlife Mitigation Projects in Oregon"

Section 2. Key words

Mark	Programmatic Categories	Mark	Activities	Mark	Project Types
	Anadromous fish		Construction		Watershed
	Resident fish	X	O & M		Biodiversity/genetics
X	Wildlife		Production		Population dynamics
	Oceans/estuaries		Research	+	Ecosystems
	Climate	+	Monitoring/eval.		Flow/survival
	Other	+	Resource mgmt		Fish disease
		+	Planning/admin.		Supplementation

____	Enforcement	__X__	Wildlife habitat en-
__+__	Acquisitions		hancement/restoration

Other keywords.

Wildlife Mitigation
McNary Target Wildlife Mitigation Species, Shrub-Steppe, Riparian and Wetland Habitat, On-site Mitigation, In-kind Mitigation

Section 3. Relationships to other Bonneville projects

Project #	Project title/description	Nature of relationship
	Securing Wildlife Mitigation Projects in Oregon	**See Section 7 under rationale and significance**
**		

Section 4. Objectives, tasks and schedules

Objectives and tasks

Obj 1,2,3	Objective	Task a,b,c	Task
1.	**Execute lease of Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge HMUs**	**a.**	**Secure O&M Funding, finalize lease arrangement with Corps**
2.	**Assess opportunities to incorporate additional federal land in Juniper Canyon (BLM) and fee title acquisition or conservation easements of available private lands**	**a.**	**Continue discussions with BLM on proposed land exchange involving Juniper Canyon lands located adjacent to Juniper HMU. Monitor real estate opportunities for availability of adjacent private lands.**
3.	**Evaluate existing conditions, identify resource opportunities/needs**	**a.**	**Conduct resource inventories including surveys and prepare resource reports**
4.	**Conduct Habitat Evaluation Procedures**	**a.**	**Compile target species models, conduct habitat suitability surveys and prepare HEP models for McNary Project target wildlife species, including futures analysis**
		b.	**Identify habitat enhancement opportunities for individual**

			target species. Incorporate into management plan (futures analyses)
5.	**Develop management plan**	**a.**	**Work with Corps, local, state, federal, and other appropriate entities to compile resource information. Establish workgroup to lead management plan development**
		b.	**Compile resource information and develop comprehensive-resource management plan -access and travel mgt -fish and wildlife habitat -noxious weeds -range resources -etc.**
6.	**Implement Management Plan, including enhancements and operations and maintenance**	**a.**	**Implement 5-Year Action Plan**

Objective schedules and costs

Objective #	Start Date mm/yyyy	End Date mm/yyyy	Cost %
1	ongoing	3/98	under current CTUIR/BPA coordination contract
2.	ongoing	ongoing	under current CTUIR/BPA coordination contract
3	5/98	10/99	20%
4	5/98	10/99	20%
5	1/99	12/99	30%
6	interim mgt 3/98	ongoing	30%

***Assumptions:**

a. Management of this project area will be integrated into a complex, encompassing the Wallula HMU, Juniper Canyon HMU, Columbia Gorge HMU, and existing Wanaket

Wildlife Mitigation Area. The CTUIR is also working with the City of Richland, Washington on a cooperative wildlife mitigation effort in the Yakima River Delta HMU and intends to incorporate this 1,090 acre area into the complex. (NOTE: the Wallula and Yakima HMU's are located in the state of Washington and will be funded under the Interim Washington Wildlife Mitigation Agreement/BPA-CTUIR MOA, 1997); Juniper Canyon, Columbia Gorge HMU, and Wanaket Wildlife Area are located in Oregon . It is believed that managing the approximately 7,200 acres (all units combined) in a complex will result in significant savings and increased efficiencies in resource management. Budgeted amounts presented in this proposal illustrate these efficiencies.
b. Assume lease arrangements for Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge HMU's will be completed by March 1998
c. September 1998, HEP and Mangement Plan are due
d. Assume FY99 begins October 1, 1998 and extends to Sept 30, 1999

Schedule constraints.

Major Milestones: Phase 1 - Finalize lease arrangements with Corps; resource inventories/HEP anlayses to establish existing condition and identify resource opportunities; development of management plan
Phase 2 - incorporate adjacent BLM lands
Phase 3 - acquire available private lands through fee title acquisition, conservation easement or exchange.

Constraints: Possible constraints might include delays due to extensive landowner negotiations, NEPA requirements, slow response times from regulatory agencies regarding issuance of permits for proposed enhancement work or coop agreements.

Phase 1 - proposal is for FY99. Project development is ongoing. Funding under program will not begin until FY99 which limits work that can be accomplished during FY98 (i.e., inventory, HEP, and development of management plan). CTUIR may be able to fund, under existing CTUIR/BPA agreement, this preliminary work to avoid uneccessary delays in project development.

Phase 2: BLM is currently proposing transfer of lands out of public ownership in spite of objectives by CTUIR, ODFW.

Phase 3: Depends on availability of adjacent private lands.

Completion date.

Operations and Maintenance and Enhancement will be covered under the NPPC Wildlife Program which requires BPA to provide adequate O&M funding to sustain the project as long as the hydro system operates (FW program measure 11.2.C.1.)

Section 5. Budget

FY99 budget by line item

Item	Note	FY99
Personnel		13,467
Fringe benefits		3770
Supplies, materials, non-expendable property		7602
Operations & maintenance	O&M is included under all items listed	
Capital acquisitions or improvements (e.g. land, buildings, major equip.)		0
PIT tags		0
Travel		1658
Indirect costs		8779
Subcontracts		4724
Other		0
TOTAL		$40,000

Outyear costs

Outyear costs	FY2000	FY01	FY02	FY03
Total budget	$40,0000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
O&M as % of total	75	75	50	50

Section 6. Abstract

The CTUIR is proposing to lease existing public owned and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the McNary Project area for purposes of protecting, enhancing, and mitigating wildlife and wildlife habitat impacted by construction of the McNary Hydroelectric Power Project. Later phases of the project contemplate addtion of BLM and private lands to the project.

Primary objectives of the project proposal is to protect, enhance, and mitigate wildlife and wildlife habitat. The project is located within the McNary Project area and provides an opportunity to mitigate wildlife habitat losses inkind and onsite where the original inundation impacts from hydropower development occurred.

Key habitat located on the Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge units includes upland shrub steppe and riparian habitat. The project includes habitat for eight (8) McNary target wildlife mitigation species including: spotted sandpiper (Actitis macularia); Canada goose (Branta canadensis); yellow warbler (Dendraica petechia); mink (Mustela vison); western meadowlark (Sturnella neglecta); California quail (Lophortyx californicus); mallard (Anas platyrhynchgos); and downy woodpecker (Picoides pubescens) The

Juniper Canyon HMU consists of approximately 329 acres and could provide a minimum of 260 Habitat Units (HU's). The Columbia Gorge HMU consists of 937 acres and could provide a minimum of 412 HU's.

Project objectives also include incorporating adjacent Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands encompassing nearly 3,750 acres. Primary habitat types include upland shrub steppe and riparian/wetland habitat.

Monitoring and evaluation will include: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Habitat Evaluation Procedures (USFWS, 1980).

Section 7. Project description

a. Technical and/or scientific background.

Introduction

In 1980, Congress passed the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (Public Law 96-501). This act, in part, mandates that mitigation is to occur for fish and widlife losses resulting from the construction and operation of federally-licensed hydroelectric facilities in Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. The act also established and charged the Northwest Power Planning Council (NWPPC) with the development of a comprehensive fish and wildlife mitigation program. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is responsible for implementation of the NWPPC fish and wildlife program funding recommendations.

In October 1994, the CTUIR contracted with the BPA to develop a Tribal mitigation plan for lands in Washington State that were ceded to the U.S. Government by the Walla, Umatilla, and Cayuse Indian Tribes in the 1855 Treaty of Walla Walla. In addition, the CTUIR also contracted with BPA in July 1995 to expand the planning effort to include ceded lands in northeast Oregon. In October 1997, the CTUIR published their plan which identified both generalized and site-specific wildlife mitigation projects. The plan identifies the mainstem Columbia River corridor, particularly existing public lands in the vicinity of the Walla Walla River and Juniper Canyon, and high priority areas to protect, enhance, and mitigate wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Coordinated State-wide Planning and Project Implementation

In October of 1995 the project known as Assessing Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Project Priorities Using GAP Analysis, hereafter referred to as BPA GAP, was initiated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife under contract with the BPA for the NWPPC mitigation program. Cooperators included the Oregon Natural Heritage Program (ONHP), the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon (CTWSR), the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), the Burns Paiute Tribe (BPT), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Oversight, historical perspective, and additional project facilitation

was provided by both the BPA and NWPPC. This project was considered an assessment and refinement of the Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Project (OTAP) which was completed in 1993 (BPA 1993).

Prior work, conducted during the OTAP, involved the identification of potential mitigation projects which were proposed to offset the losses caused by the construction of the four lower Columbia River and the eight Willamette River basin hydroelectric facilities. The assessments and calculations of wildlife losses mitigative credits are found in multiple documents written over a period of six years (Bedrossian et. al. 1985; Noyes et. al. 1985a, 1985b, 1985c, 1985d, 1986; Preston et. al. 1987; Rasmussen and Wright 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, 1990d). The current project drew from and enhanced the previous efforts through the use of a GIS and GAP Analysis.

The Precursor: The Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Project

The BPA determined that beginning in 1992 so-called "wildlife trust agreements" would be pursued with the wildlife management agencies of each state. These agreements were intended to take the place of the annual project submittal and approval process which, by 1993, had resulted in only three wildlife projects implemented region-wide. The trust agreements between the BPA and each state would include signatories from each tribe and agency responsible for implementing mitigation measures within the respective states. In order to develop an effective trust agreement it was necessary to determine what the mitigation objectives of the agreement would be and the economic costs of achieving those objectives. The wildlife managers and tribes in Oregon chose to develop the implementation team known as the Oregon Wildlife Coalition (OWC) and the OTAP as the means of achieving those objectives.

The OTAP consisted of two parts. The first was the compilation of a database which contained information about potential mitigation sites. This information originated from OWC project sponsors, various tribal and state management and mitigation plans, and the Oregon Natural Heritage Database. The second component of the OTAP consisted of gathering land values from recent land sales and appraisals within the geographic areas and habitat types where mitigation activities were likely to occur. A range of potential trust agreement costs was also calculated. This range was based upon the assumption of complete mitigation for the wildlife losses in Oregon.

The BPA GAP Project used the database component of the OTAP as a baseline information source for the purposes of analysis. The economic valuation information was not used for the GAP analysis but a current version of similar information is being compiled by the regional Wildlife Working Group (WWG) for project evaluation. Additionally, new economic information will most likely be incorporated in fiscal year 1998 during the implementation phase of the BPA GAP Project. It is noteworthy the BPA has determined that "wildlife trust agreements" are no longer considered the preferred method of developing state wide agreements.

What is GAP Analysis?

The National GAP Analysis Project began in 1988 with the states of Idaho and Oregon. It was coordinated by the USFWS from the Washington D.C. office (Scott and LaRoe 1993; Pennisi 1993). Today the U.S. Geological Survey spearheads the effort with over 200 collaborating organizations including businesses, universities, and local, state, and federal governments representing 32 states (Scott 1994).

One of the primary objectives of the project includes establishing ecological and social datasets, based on geographic location within each state, which will eventually lead to an analysis of the health and degree of "protectedness" of biodiversity in the United States (Scott et. Al. 1993; Machlis et. Al. 1994). Thus, the term GAP refers to the gaps in protection designed for the biological ecosystems upon which all life is dependent. The fundamental unit of analysis and protection is the vegetation or habitat type. The vegetation/habitat types are considered catalysts and therefore predictors of wildlife occurrence and in general, biodiversity itself.

The GAP project is considered a proactive rather than reactive form of focusing and directing land management activities. Traditional wildlife management has dealt with individual species and often only after the species has reached an elevated level of peril (Scott 1994). In many cases the management or protection comes only after the species has been designated as "at risk of extinction" (Forman and Gordon 1986; Harris 1984). Reactive management is costly, narrowly focused (often a single species), occurs relatively frequently, species in the same habitat type are dealt with separately (eg. spotted owl and marbled murrelet), and in some cases may occur too late (eg. Snake River sockeye salmon).

The information compiled and generated by the GAP Analysis program is intended to be used for the development of a biodiversity management plan. This approach also differs from historic management by considering common as well as rare species through the realization that all species are equally worthy of management and protection (Scott 1994). Rather than waiting for complex ecological, social, and economic problems, which may drive species near to extinction, GAP gathers the known information about communities and the nature of their protection before it is too late. This allows land managers to 1) assess the current land management situation, 2) identify important areas in need of further research, 3) develop and analyze management options, and 4) take steps towards insuring protection of biodiversity before additional species become threatened or endangered with extinction.

The BPA GAP Project adopted many of the techniques and objectives of the national program described above. New methods were also developed which may assist with similar activities in the future. It is hoped that through the use of these tools the BPA wildlife mitigation projects in Oregon will continue to be planned using the most current scientific method available. And while providing necessary credits to BPA for the wildlife losses a robust network of protected areas will be dedicated to complement existing refugia for target species and others.

Description of the State-wide Project Area

The project area remains the same as that which was used for the OTAP. That is, all watersheds in Oregon which drain into the Columbia River. There is one exception and it is the Harney Basin. A more detailed description is found in the OTAP final report (BPA 1993).

In all, there are 12 federally licensed hydroelectric dams and facilities which are considered for the purposes of BPA wildlife mitigation in the state. On the mainstem Columbia River these are: Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, and McNary dams and associated facilities. On the Willamatte River tributaries Big Cliff, Detroit, Green Peter, Foster, Cougar, Dexter, Lookout Point, and Hills Creek dams and facilities are found.

Potential mitigation areas associated with the Columbia River dams include the Hood River, Deschutes River, John Day River, Umatilla River, Walla Walla River, Grande Ronde River, Powder River, Silver Creek, Silvies River, and Malheur River watersheds. Numerous smaller watersheds scattered between these are also included. The Willamette region includes lower Columbia River tributaries and all of the Willamette River basin.

State-wide Project Goal

The primary goal of the project was to prioritize and depict the contribution of each proposed mitigation site to target species and habitats as well as overall biodiversity in the state and/or ecoregion within which it is found. It is important to note that the primary objective of the mitigation program is to mitigate for habitats and species lost through inundation. That objective can be met and exceeded when potential mitigation sites are selected using a GAP analysis.

Objective 1: Review and develop criteria for prioritization of project sites.

Develop draft criteria

The first step towards developing prioritization criteria was to review the work which had been conducted for the OTAP. The previous project involved the formulation of a Joint Advisory Committee which decided to employ a “coarse filter/fine filter” approach using two sets of criteria. The first set was used as a coarse filter to “weed-out” some of the more than 500 potential project nominations. The second set of criteria was used to rank the remaining potential projects based on mitigative and biological qualities. The coarse filter criteria which were statutory or otherwise crucial consisted of the following:

1. Projects must be located within a pre-determined geographic area. A map showing the geographic limitations of consideration is included (*Figure 1*).
2. Projects must complement activities of regional, federal and state wildlife agencies, and tribes.
3. Project does not impose funding responsibilities of others on BPA.
4. Project does not adversely affect State or Federally listed Threatened or Endangered species.

The use of these criteria was effective at removing approximately half of the projects originally submitted. The remaining 287 projects were then ranked using the following fine filter criteria:

1. Directly mitigates impacts from hydropower development on-site. Score 0 or 1
First consideration should be given to high quality on-site opportunities

2. Protect and/or enhance high priority habitat and indicator species as adopted by the Northwest Power Planning Council. Score 0 or 1.

3. Protect or enhance natural ecosystems and species diversity over the long term.
Score: 1 = proposal addresses either naturally self-sustaining ecosystem or species diversity, 2 = previously natural self-sustaining ecosystem that needs management actions to restore it to a natural self-sustaining ecosystem that will provide species diversity, and 3 = natural self-sustaining ecosystem that provides maximum species diversity.

4. Provides a direct benefit to State or Federal listed T&E, Federal and State Candidate, or sensitive animal species. Score 0 or 1

5. Provide habitat benefits to both wildlife and anadramous, State Sensitive, culturally significant, or T&E fish species. Score 0 or .5

During the review of the criteria and database products from the OTAP it became apparent that the previous project's strength was found in the use of existing BPA and NWPPC procedures. But, it lacked the use of current scientific methodology found in the fields of Conservation Biology and Landscape Ecology. To add those elements in this project, a series of OWC meetings was scheduled for the spring of 1996 after coordination with other conservation planning efforts and a review of current literature pertaining to biodiversity conservation planning, GAP Analysis, and GIS techniques. A list of questions which would form the basis of project prioritization criteria was put together and discussed during the OWC meetings.

The Site Specific, CTUIR Proposed Projects (Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge HMU's)

Consistent with the NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program, OWC criteria including GAP and the CTUIR Wildlife Mitigation Plan, the CTUIR are submitting the Juniper and Columbia Gorge Wildlife Mitigation Project under the program for formal consideration. The Juniper Canyon area and mainstem Columbia River is home to the sovereign CTUIR. Juniper Canyon and the middle mainstem Columbia River lies within the Tribes ceded area in Umatilla County. The project proposal involves development of a formal land and resource lease arrangement between the CTUIR and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District. Lands included in the formal lease will include the Wallula HMU, 2158 acres (Habitat Management Unit) in Washington and Juniper Canyon (329 acres) and Columbia Gorge (937 acres) HMU's located in northeast Oregon.

As part of wildlife mitigation project development, the CTUIR are also working with state and federal agencies to incorporate additional adjacent public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Approximately 3,750 acres of land in the Juniper

Canyon area adajacent to the Juniper Canyon HMU have been proposed for exchange by the BLM (Northeast Oregon Assembled Land Exchange, Draft EIS September 1997). In addition, the project proposal includes potential future acquistion of available private lands based on a willing seller basis.

There are regionally important wildlife resources and terrestrial habitat types, and archaeological resources represented on these properties. The Columbia Gorge HMU is located on the south shore of the Columbia River and consists of 7 parcels of land ranging in size from 33.1 acres to 396.7 acres. These parcels account for 936.7 acres of upland and riparian habitats. Juniper Canyon HMU lies adjacent to U.S. Highway 730 on the south side of Lake Wallula at Columbia River mile 305. This unit contains 318 acres of land and 11 acres of embayment or mudflat.

The Desired Future Condition (DFC) for the Juniper and Columbia Gorge HMU's is to sponsor and promote management activities that protect, enhance, and mitigate wildlife habitat. Site-specific and resource-specific DFC's will be developed during development of the site-specific management plan for the habitat units.

The completion of the McNary project in 1953 brought about a rapid change in the area surrounding the mouth of the Walla Walla River. Silt, which was once washed out into and down the Columbia River, contributed to the creation of a large delta and several wetlands (only three of which remain today) in what was previously open water. Remaining wetlands are rapidly decreasing in size and value for wildlife due to silt depositions from flood waters and turbidity created by rough fish (carp and bullheads).

The Washington Department of Wildlife (WDW) managed the unit from 1953 to 1985 when the license was returned to the Corps due to a short fall in state funds. At that time, the Corps resumed management of the area and has retained some of the State's management practices including the planting and flooding of a moist soil area and agricultural leasing. New practices implemented by the Corps include measures to control noxious weeds, restrict off-road vehicle use, and provide additional suitable wildlife habitat.

b. Proposal objectives.

The development of dams for hydropower, navigation, flood control, and irrigation in the Columbia River Basin resulted in widespread inundation of riparian, riverine, and upland wildlife habitats (NPPC 1994; BPA et. al., 1993). In addition, dam development inundated traditional Native American hunting, gathering, and fishing areas, destroyed pre-historic and historic Indian village sites, and flooded sacred Indian burial grounds. From time immemorial, the Columbia Plateau supported a diversity and abundance of fish, wildlife, and plant resources and supplied local Indian tribes with natural resources for subsistence, traditional lifestyles, economic, and cultural and spiritual well being (CTUIR, 1994).

The Power Act mandates that fish and wildlife losses resulting from development of the federal hydroelectric system in the states of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington be mitigated. The Power Act established and charged the Council with the task of developing a comprehensive fish and wildlife mitigation program to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife habitat in the Columbia Basin (Power Act 1980, Section 4 (H)(1)(A), page 12; NPPC 1994, Section 2, page 2-1). This program, initially adopted in 1982, was amended in 1984, 1987, 1991-1993, and 1994. Consistent with Section 1003(7) of the Power Council Fish and Wildlife Program, BPA is authorized and obligated to fund implementation of projects that will help reach the Power Council wildlife mitigation goals and objectives.

Objectives of the CTUIR's proposal is to develop and implement wildlife mitigation projects that achieve the goals and objectives of the NPPC Fish and Wildlife Program and assist BPA in meeting obligations to compensate for lost wildlife habitat in the Columbia River Basin. Specific goals and objectives for these management units include: 1) securing perpetual benefits for McNary target wildlife mitigation species; 2) controlling noxious weed infestations and promoting native plant communities; 3) development and implementation of adjacent mitigation project opportunities (i.e., fee title acquisition of adjacent lands) to complement and expand benefits achieved on the units.

Specific objectives for the projects are embedded, at least in part, on protecting, enhancing, and generating HU's for McNary Target Wildlife Mitigation Species. Securing the lease from the Corps, implementing subsequent habitat enhancements such as: weed control, seeding and planting native species, boundary definition, fence maintenance, and garbage control, and conducting operations and maintenance on the properties is expected to result in the generation of an estimated 672 minimum habitat units (based on CTUIR preliminary HEP evaluation for BPA/CTUIR MOA, 1997)

c. Rationale and significance to Regional Programs.

Regionally, upland shrub-steppe habitats are threatened. This habitat, once common in the Columbia Plateau, exists now only in scattered tracts and a few large contiguous tracts including the COE/BLM complex proposed for this project, Boardman Bombing Range, and the Umatilla Army Depot in Oregon and the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and Yakima Bombing Range in Washington. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife has formally identified shrub-steppe as a priority habitat for protection in the state of Washington.

The OWC coordinated planning, prioritization, and implementation of mitigation projects using ODFW GAP analysis and landscape level restoration ecology methodologies applied in coordination with other resource managers in Oregon and Washington, will help assure long term viability of this project and shrub-steppe habiatats in the region. The location of these lands in proximity to other Corps Leases and with Wanaket Mitigation Area will reduce costs through economies of scale and reduced duplication.

d. Project history

1. History of Bonneville Wildlife Mitigation Efforts

Under the Northwest Power Act, the Council is required to include in its Fish and Wildlife Program measures to "protect, mitigate, and enhance" fish and wildlife affected by the development and operation of hydroelectric facilities on the Columbia River and its tributaries. Bonneville's Administrator is required to use his funds and authorities to carry out such mitigation in a manner consistent with the Council's Program.

Prior to 1988: At the Council's direction, Bonneville funded wildlife loss studies for construction of and inundation by the major hydroelectric dams. The first studies completed were those for Libby and Hungry Horse Dams. The Council reviewed the losses, amended its Program to specify the number of acres of habitat and species that would constitute adequate mitigation and authorized Bonneville to proceed with mitigation projects.

Rather than carry out the mitigation itself, Bonneville undertook negotiations with the State of Montana with the intent of having Montana undertake the mitigation. Because year-to-year contracts with Montana were not viewed as an administratively practical way of acquiring and maintaining habitat, the Council and the region's utilities encouraged Bonneville to consider establishing a trust fund, giving Montana flexibility to acquire and maintain habitat as the opportunity arose.

Wildlife Rule: In November 1989, the Council took up wildlife mitigation for most of the remaining federal hydroelectric projects in the Columbia River basin. Because there was widespread disagreement about the loss estimates and the hydropower share of those losses, the Council did not make any determination about the total mitigation due at any of these projects. Instead, the Council amended the Program to include a wildlife mitigation goal of achieving 35% of the agency-submitted losses during the next decade, using the agency estimates as a "starting point".

The Wildlife Rule established a two-track process (including project specific criteria) for implementation of wildlife projects. One track called for projects to be submitted to Bonneville under the Implementation Planning Process. Once projects are reviewed and selected for inclusion in the Bonneville Annual Implementation Workplan the Council's Wildlife Advisory Committee reviews them. The other track permits agreements if agreed to by all parties for a particular facility.

The Council adopted the final rule in November 1993. The rule continued to call for short-term (Section 11.3D) agreements and states that if Bonneville cannot enter into such agreements in 90 days then the Council will solicit projects from the agencies and tribes and approve them for implementation. If short-term agreements are not in place thereafter the Council will call for project proposals each October thereafter; long term agreements are to be in place in 3 years. Bonneville failed to enter into short-term agreements with states and tribes and Council solicited project proposals in late February, 1994.

Since 1994 Bonneville has funded only a few new, individual wildlife mitigation projects outside the above agreements. This was due to the agreements using most or all of the available funds and a lack of any stable commitment from Bonneville to fund wildlife mitigation. In August of 1995 the Council completed a Resident Fish rule-making that included an amendment to establish specific funding percentages for Bonneville's Direct Program budget under the MOA: 70% for anadromous fish and 15% each for Resident Fish and Wildlife. Thus from FY96 through FY01 the region's wildlife managers have or will have approximately $15M per year (plus interest) for wildlife mitigation. While most of the available funds through FY98 will be used finishing up the Washington Interim Agreement, some funds have been available for use on other individual projects, notably the Chief Joseph and Southern Idaho projects. Unfortunately, in the history of Bonneville wildlife mitigation under the Council's program, little of Oregon's losses has been mitigated.

2. Oregon Wildlife Coalition

In 1991 the Oregon Wildlife Coalition (OWC) was formed made up of wildlife managers from the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW), the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon (CTWSRO), the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), the Burns-Paiute Tribe (BPT), and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The Coalition developed proposals to address Bonneville concerns for having an "outcomes" based approach and then submitted a proposal for an Oregon planning process to the Council later that year. From fall of 1991 to June of 1992 the OWC negotiated with Bonneville over funding the proposal, which in July of 1992 became the Oregon Trust Agreement (OTA) Planning Project (BPA #92-84).

In October of 1993, after a year of development the OWC publishes an Oregon planning document, the "Brown Book". Then in January of 1994 they begin meeting to formulate a strategy for trust negotiations with Bonneville and in February the Coalition requests in writing that Bonneville begin negotiations. This met the Council's deadline for trying to get to interim agreements within 90 days after the rule went into effect. In March Bonneville responds positively and identifies its' lead negotiators.

Between April and July five coalition sessions were held; Bonneville attended 3 of those meetings. At the initial meeting it was agreed that the parties would develop principles of negotiation. The parties exchanged documents on these issues and agreed that the

negotiations should initially focus on technical issues that would define the biological basis for mitigation before the issue of money was to be discussed. Bonneville negotiators agreed to this strategy. It was agreed that the focus of the discussions would be the "Brown Book" losses and the Oregon mitigation planning proposal. It was proposed that a technical committee, including both Bonneville staff and coalition members would work together to develop the technical proposal. Bonneville stated that they would have to get the administrators concurrence before they could commit to such a procedure. The process then broke down when it became apparent that no funds would be available and that Bonneville was moving away from trusts. The coalition stopped meeting for over a year.

During these years the Council's wildlife advisory group had become the Wildlife Working Group (WWG, and also the CBFWA Wildlife Caucus), made up of all the wildlife managers in the Columbia Basin. They meet regularly to help implement the Council's wildlife rule and in doing so developed, reviewed and adopted habitat assessment tools and strategies. Once it became apparent from the Council's 1995 rule-making and the MOA negotiations that wildlife funding would become stable at approximately $15M per year through 2001, the WWG started discussions of both long- and short-term funding for future wildlife mitigation in the Basin. Various strategies were discussed, but all agreed that Oregon had not received a reasonable share of funds spent to date. In the end a budget was developed and adopted by the WWG covering Bonneville funds through 2001 (attached). This budget called for Oregon's wildlife mitigation to receive $275K in FY97, $500K in FY98, $4M in FY99, $5M in FY00 and $6M in FY01. The first two years are for planning and coordination, the next three for project implementation.

In helping develop Oregon wildlife mitigation budget as members of the WWG, Oregon's coalition members agreed to come together once again to start developing startegies on how best to implement wildlife mitigation in Oregon. Also at this time a project to reaffirm the original findings of the OTA Planning Project was completed. This project, Assessing Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Process Using GAP Analysis (BPA #95-65), provided a more rigorous scientific/policy filter on the sites originally identified in the "Brown Book" and demonstrated the validity and applicability of that effort.

The OWC has met continually since this time and developed a coordination and planning budget for FY97, which due to contracting problems was not initiated until fall of 1997. This allowed the entities involved to provide staff dedicated to this planning and implementation effort. For FY98, since much of the coordination for this year was using FY97 funds, the coalition developed and proposed the initiation of a small group of projects scattered throughout the state along with some continued funding of planning and coordination. For the current year specific project areas have been identified for purchase, enhancement or O&M along with a small coordination budget.

3. CTUIR Wildlife Mitigation Project Proposal Development

The CTUIR initiated planning and identification of Tribal wildlife mitigation project priorities and opportunities in late 1995 under the Interim Washington Wildlife Mitigation

Agreement and the CTUIR/BPA Umatilla River Riparian Corridor Project. Distribution of the Draft CTUIR Wildlife Mitigation Plan in May 1996 initiated formal discussions between the CTUIR and Corps on potential leasing of several habitat units located in the McNary Project area.

In October, 1997, the CTUIR formally presented the Corps Lease proposal for Juniper and Columbia Gorge HMU's to the Oregon and Regional Wildlife Managers for consideration and prioritiziation. The on-site / in-kind nature of the mitigation and the use of existing public lands met the direction of the NPPC program, Regional Wildlife Work Group Criteria, and the Oregon Coalition's project criteria including GAP.

e. Methods.

Methods to carry out the project will consist of both active and passage restoration techniques including boundary definition (new fence construction and repair/maintenance of fencing), weed control, and native plantings where appropriate. Various forms of site preparation, including prescribed fire and manual techniques could be utilized to improve restoration success. Garbage control and collection will be accomplished and installation of interpretive displayed will be completed as part of public information/education program.

Resource assessments include HEP (USFWS, 1980) for target wildlife mitigation species, botanical, and archaeolgical. The area is known its rich ethnographic and cultural resources. Cultural resources important to the CTUIR have been identified on the properties and the Tribes continue to utilize these lands for exercise of treaty rights.

The project will ultimately provide a linkage between tracts of land currently under management by two distinct federal agencies (e..g, Corps and BLM). Additional lands may be incorporated in the future to increase the size of the area brought under management in the program and provide a core block of land beneficial to upland shrub-steppe obligate species. The project is critically linked to the existing Wanaket wildlife mitigation area and the Wallula HMU in the state of Washington. The CTUIR is working with the Corps to lease the units in a single lease agreement. The inability to secure the Juniper Canyon and Columbia Gorge HMU could jeopardize securing the Wallula unit which encompasses approximately 2,158 acres of upland shrub-steppe and association riparian/wetland habitats.

f. Facilities and equipment.

Facilites and equipment for this project will be funded through the BPA wildlife budget. Integration of management for these properties, including staffing and equipment, with the existing Wanaket Wildlife area and other Corps land brought under CTUIR management will provide cost effective management through economies of scale and reduced duplication. Equipment and facilities necessary to implement the scope of work described above generally exists currently.

g. References.

BPA 1997a. Watershed Management Program Final Environmental Impact Statement. DOE/EIS - 0265. Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR

BPA 1997b. Wildlife Mitigation Program Final Environmental Impact Statement. DOE/EIS - 0246. Portland, OR

BPA 1997c. Wildlife Mitigation Program Record of Decision. DOE/EIS - 0246. Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR

CRITFC 1995. Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi-Wa-Kush-Wit: The spirit of the salmon. Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission, Portland, OR

Csuti, B., A.J. Kimerling, T.A. O'Neil, M.M. Shaughnessy, E. Gaines, M.M.P. Huso. 1997. *Atlas of Oregon Wildlife: distribution, habitat, and natural history*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR.

Interior, U. S. D. 1980. Habitat as a Basis for Environmental Assessment. ESM 101, Release 4-80. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Ecological Services, Washinton, D.C.

NPPC 1994. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. NPPC 94-55. Northwest Power Planning Council, Portland, OR

ODFW 1997. Assessing Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Project Using GAP Analysis. In fullfillment of Project Number 95-65, Contract Number DE-BI179-92BP90299. Prepare for: U.S. Bonneville Power Administration; Project Cooperators: U.S, Fish and Wildlife Service, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, Burn Paiute Tribe, Oregon Natural Heritage Program, Portland, OR

Orr, E. L., W. N. Orr, and E. M. Baldwin. 1976. *Geology of Oregon*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing, Dubuque, IA.

USDA 1996. Status of the interior Columbia basin: summary of scientific finding. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-385. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR

Wissmar, R. C., J.E. Smith, B.A. McIntosh, H.W. Li, G.H. Reeves, J.R. Sedell. 1994. A history of Resource use and disturbance in riverine basins of Eastern Oregon and Washington (early 1800s-1900s). *Northwest Science* 68: 1-35.

BPA. 1993. Oregon Trust Agreement Planning Project: Potential Mitigation to the Impacts on Oregon Wildlife Resources Associated with Relevant Mainstem Columbia River

and Willamette River Hydroelectric Projects. Bonneville Power Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, Portland, OR. DOE/BP-90299-1. 53pp plus Appendices.

Bedrossian, K.L., J. H. Noyes and M.S. Potter. 1985. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Assessment at Lookout Point Dam and Reservoir Project Middle Fork Willamette River, Oregon. Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 72pp.

Forman, R.T. and M. Gordon. 1986. Landscape Ecology. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Harris, L.D.. 1984. The Fragmented Forest: Island Biogeography Theory and the Preservation of Biotic Diversity. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Machlis, G., D. Forester, and J. McKendry. 1994. Gap analysis and the National Parks: adding the socioeconomic dimension. Park Science. National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. 5pp.

Noyes, J.H., M.S. Potter and K.L. Bedrossian. 1985a. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Assessment at Detroit and Big Cliff Dam and Reservoir Project North Santiam River, Oregon. Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 76pp.

Noyes, J.H., M.S. Potter and K.L. Bedrossian. 1985b. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Asessment at Dexter Dam and Reservoir Project Middle Fork Willamette River, . Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 63pp.

Noyes, J.H., M.S. Potter and K.L. Bedrossian. 1985c. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Assessment at Hills Creek Dam and Reservoir Project Middle Fork Willamette River, Oregon. Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 73pp.

Noyes, J.H., M.S. Potter and K.L. Bedrossian. 1985d. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Assessment at Cougar Dam and Reservoir Project South Fork McKenzie River, Oregon.Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 71pp.

Noyes, J.H., M.S. Potter and K.L. Bedrossian. 1986. Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Loss Assessment at Green Peter-Foster Project Middle Fork Santiam River, Oregon. Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 84pp.

Pennisi, E. 1993. Filling in the gaps. Science News, Vol 144. 4pp.

Preston, S., Noyes, J., and Potter, M. 1987. A wildlife habitat protection, mitigation, and enhancement plan for eight federal hydroelectric facilities in the Willamette River Basin.Prepared by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 85pp plus Appendices.

Rasmussen, L. and P. Wright. 1990a. Wildlife impact assessment, Bonneville Project, Oregon and Washington. Prepared by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for U.S. Dept. Of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 37pp.

Rasmussen, L. and P. Wright. 1990b. Wildlife impact assessment, McNary Project, Oregon and Washington. Prepared by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for U.S. Dept. Of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 46pp.

Rasmussen, L. and P. Wright. 1990c. Wildlife impact assessment, John Day Project, Oregon and Washington. Prepared by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for U.S. Dept. Of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 47pp.

Rasmussen, L. and P. Wright. 1990d. Wildlife impact assessment, The Dalles Project, Oregon and Washington. Prepared by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for U.S. Dept. Of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR. 34pp.

Scott, M.J. and E. T. LaRoe. 1993. Status and directions of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Gap Analysis Program in 1993. Gap Analysis Bulletin No. 3. 2pp.

Scott, M.J., F. Davis, B. Csuti, R. Noss, B. Butterfield, C. Groves, H. Anderson, S. Caicco, F. D'Erchia, T. C. Edwards Jr., J. Ulliman, and R.G. Wright. 1993. Gap Analysis: a geographic approach to protection of biological diversity. Wildlife Monograph no. 123. 41 pp.

Scott, M.J. 1994. Preface. National Biological Survey Gap Analysis Program Handbook, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID., 3pp.

Section 8. Relationships to other projects

Section 9. Key personnel

All CTUIR Department of Natural Resource staff funded under this project are professionally trained and meet standard job descriptions (professional and technical grade and series requirements) es tablished under the CTUIR Policy and Procedures Manual (under current revision, 1998). Technical staff involved in implementing the work identified under this proposal includes biological and administrative staff.

Name: Carl Scheeler

Title: Wildlife Program Manager
Months funded this project: 0.15 mos
Education: MS Wildlife 1981 Oregon State University
Experience: 15 years fisheries/wildlife experience; last 10 years CTUIR Program Manager; expertise in multi-project development, coordination, and oversight.

Name: Allen Childs
Title: Wildlife Biologist
Months funded this project: 0.8 mos
Education: BS Wildlife Management 1989 Eastern Oregon University; A.S. Science/Fish and Wildlife Management 1985, College of Eastern Utah
Experience: 12 years fisheries and wildlife experience

Section 10. Information/technology transfer

Project reports of accomplishments are produced quarterly and annually. Project personnel sponsor field tours at any time requested to show accomplishments, challenges, and techniques. Project personnel also frequently participate in local public forums (workshops, classrooms, clubs, etc.). HEP models and other M&E elements will be shared with Regional wildlife managers.